



Revised and accepted by the Citizen Advisory Committee on December 10, 2015.

Meeting Summary

Citizen Advisory Committee – Comprehensive Plan Update

November 19, 2015 - 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Hillsboro Civic Center - Room 113B

150 E. Main Street

Hillsboro, OR 97123

Members Present

Marc Cardinaux, Aron Carleson, Katie Eyre, Wil Fuentes, John Godsey, Bonnie Kookan, Glenn Miller, Tricia Mortell, Daniel Nguyen, Ahne Oosterhof, Ken Phelan, Bryan Welsh

Members Excused

Mica Annis, Steve Callaway, Gwynne Pitts

Staff Present

Colin Cooper, Rob Dixon, Aaron Ray, Emily Tritsch, Laura Weigel

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened with introductions of the committee members.

Minutes – October 22, 2015

The minutes were approved with the modification of “Library Advisory Board” to “Library Board”.

Housing Needs Analysis Summary

Emily Tritsch presented findings from the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) prepared by ECONorthwest. Beth Goodman, a senior planner for ECONorthwest, participated via phone to provide additional technical detail during the presentation. Results of the HNA found that Hillsboro is meeting and exceeding state requirements, but that opportunities for additional development of single-family detached housing need to be identified. Development outside of the city limits will be important for accommodating future growth, especially in providing diverse housing types. Looking at redevelopment opportunities in the long-term within the current city limits would also be beneficial to providing additional housing opportunity for the city’s growing population.

Committee members raised a number of questions during the presentation, including:

- Will the Jackson East UGB expansion area ultimately be residential or industrial? Staff indicated that this area was designated to be employment land by the Oregon Legislature in House Bill 4078, and is therefore planned for industrial or employment use.
- What is the difference between density and capacity? Staff responded that capacity is the type and amount of residential development theoretically possible on a particular parcel, where density is the number of units actually developed. In the HNA, capacity is calculated based on Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations, where density is determined based on an analysis of historic development trends and reasonable projections of future development.
- Is the City obligated to build to 80% of capacity under Metro guidelines? Staff reviewed existing Comprehensive Plan policies that addresses this requirement and added that Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan also places this obligation on the City. The City is currently in compliance with this requirement, and Metro has recognized the City's effort to achieve this goal in its Orenco Station and AmberGlen planning work.
- To what extent does long term ownership impact affordability (with only 22% of owners cost-burdened), and how will the ten-year outlook of an even split between new owners and renters play a role? Staff responded that Hillsboro's trends in terms of owner/renter split and affordability are consistent with other areas of the region and state, and that owner cost burden is lower because of the economics of long term ownership and the likelihood that these homes were purchased when they were less expensive.
- How does the wage required to afford a two-bedroom apartment in Washington County (\$18.15) compare to other counties in Oregon? Staff responded that this data is collected for the metropolitan area as a whole; therefore the statistic is the same for Multnomah and Clackamas counties. Compared with other areas of the state, however, this rate is very high.
- What does multigenerational housing look like? Staff explained that multigenerational households are often headed by someone aged 35-55 with children and older parents also living in the household.
- What are cottage-style houses, and how do they compare to tiny houses, accessory dwelling units, or "mother-in-law" homes? Staff indicated that while exact definitions of these terms are still under development, cottage housing, tiny houses, and accessory dwelling units are all distinct. Staff offered these very broad descriptions as examples, but indicated that more precise definitions would be included in housing goals and policies at a later date:
 - Cottage housing: Homes that are often 1200-1500 square feet on smaller lots, often clustered around a common area.
 - Accessory Dwelling Units/"Mother-in-law" homes: Smaller homes up to 800 square feet on a lot with another existing house.
 - Tiny Houses: This is a much less defined term, as it brings up a number of questions including whether the unit is moveable or on a foundation, whether it has full water and sewer connections, etc.

Staff concluded the presentation by reiterating that Hillsboro is in compliance with the Metropolitan Housing Rule, and that the City will be providing the opportunity for at least 50% of housing as attached or multifamily development in the future. The City is also exceeding density requirements set by Metro. Findings from the HNA indicate the need to provide additional capacity for single-family detached housing and opportunities to meet housing needs at all income levels. Development in South Hillsboro will meet some of these needs with additional capacity expected from future expansion areas in Witch Hazel Village South and Bendemeer.

Committee members were curious about future plans for potential redevelopment of the Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway corridor. Staff explained that as South Hillsboro is developed, there could be opportunities for new development along the corridor, particularly near planned interchanges at Cornelius Pass Road, which will put portions of the corridor in relatively close proximity to the planned Town Center in South Hillsboro. The TV Highway corridor offers good potential transportation and transit opportunities, and could potentially be an attractive location for residential redevelopment in the future.

Housing Draft Goals & Policies

Laura Weigel introduced the housing draft goals and policies, explaining that this work is still in progress. Staff provided committee members with an updated draft including changes made since the committee packet was distributed. Staff is also in the process of cross-checking that current Comprehensive Plan language is accommodated in new policies, as reflected by notations in the draft.

In addition to developing draft goals and policies, staff and the consultant are also working to identify some potential implementation actions for each policy to ensure that action items raised in the Housing Needs Analysis or otherwise identified by the Housing Needs Analysis Subcommittee are being addressed sufficiently. [Staff note: In most other topics, implementation actions will be developed in a subsequent phase of the update project.] Housing policies are organized into six goals covering housing choice, affordability, design, land supply, innovation, and sustainability.

Staff reviewed the policies under each goal with the committee and asked for input, suggestions, or questions that the committee had. The committee's feedback included:

- Goal 1: Provide opportunities for the development of a variety of housing choices that meet the needs and preferences of current and future households.
 - Policy 1.1: The committee discussed whether “affordable housing” would be better language than “government-assisted affordable housing”. The consensus was that leaving the policy as written was appropriate to ensure that the policy captured the need for interagency collaboration to provide and maintain affordable housing in tandem with market-provided housing development.
 - Policy 1.3: Committee members expressed concern the term “residents with disabilities” when discussing housing needs as it may leave out other populations that sometimes have similar challenges, such as aging populations. Staff responded that they would examine how to clarify the policy.

- Goal 2: Provide opportunities for housing at prices and rents that meet the needs of current and future households of all income levels.
 - Policy 2.4: Committee members had questions about the precision of some of the terminology being used, such as “clustering” and “affordable”. Staff responded that definitions for these terms are being developed.
- Goal 3: Foster distinct and vibrant districts and neighborhoods that serve the daily needs of nearby residents that are safely accessible by walking, biking, transit or a short commute.
 - Policy 3.1: The committee amending the policy to ensure that neighborhoods are “...attractive, healthy, and safe places to live...”.
 - Policy 3.3: Committee members expressed concern that the policy could focus too much on transit service, potentially to the detriment of personal vehicles and the provision of parking with housing. Staff agreed to re-examine the policy.
 - Policy 3.4: The committee indicated that the present policy language was unclear in its intent and impact. Staff responded that they would examine the language, add context, and define terms as needed to clarify the policy.

Due to time constraints, remaining goals and policies will be examined at the December meeting.

Updated Goals & Policies from Prior Topics

Aaron Ray reviewed updates to goals and policies for Public Involvement, Historic Resources and Library Services based on feedback from the committee at the October meeting. Changes included:

- Public Involvement: Policy 2.4 was rewritten to clarify language about designing public involvement activities.
- Historic Resources: A new goal was added to address awareness, education and outreach.
- Library Services: Only minor edits were made.

These topics, including Background Reports and goals and policies reflecting committee input, will be presented to the Planning Commission in a worksession scheduled for December 2015.

Upcoming Meeting Schedules and Topics

Committee members discussed dates for upcoming meetings, with some discussion of the potential for rescheduling meetings in December. [Staff note: The meeting was not rescheduled.] The January meeting date conflicts with the State of the City address, and will likely need to be rescheduled. Staff will clarify upcoming meeting dates, times, and locations, and communicate those to the committee.

Public Comment

No members of the public offered comment at the meeting.

Adjournment

With no additional business to consider, the CAC meeting was adjourned.